

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 have been examined. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-27 will be pending.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim to foreign priority. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted April 22, 2004. An Information Disclosure Statement was submitted May 31, 2007, and Applicant respectfully requests required consideration of the document listed therein. Lastly, the Examiner has not indicated the state of the drawings. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to accept the drawings on the next action.

Objections

Claims 8 and 22 are objected to because of formalities. Specifically, claims 8 and 22 recite “interval and interval.” As suggested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended the claims to remove the repeated phrase and respectfully requests the Examiner to remove the objection.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 11, 12, and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,750,840 to Morita (hereinafter “Morita”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

For example, claim 1 recites the feature of a drive circuit for, *inter alia*, supplying a write-in voltage for a period corresponding to the distance from the row line to end points. In

rejecting the claim, the Examiner cites to Morita (Fig. 9, items 22 and 24; col. 12, lines 51–59) as allegedly disclosing this feature.*

The cited portions of Morita describe using a voltage transformation circuit to supply an increased (boosted) voltage data signal, with the *voltage level supplied varying by the distance* to the end points. In cited Fig. 9 of Morita, the voltage transformation circuit 25 adds a boosted voltage based on a count value determined by distance from end points (*see, e.g.,* col. 11, lines 8–12; col. 12, lines 31–34).

The cited portions of Morita do not disclose a drive circuit for supplying a write-in voltage for a *period corresponding to the distance* from the row line to end points. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Morita.

Claims 11 and 15 recite features similar to claim 1, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 15 are also patentable over Morita, for the same reasons.

The remaining rejected claims are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 13, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Morita. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

* Applicant notes that there is no reference number 24 in Fig. 9 and respectfully assumes the Examiner was referring to the voltage transformation circuit 25 of Fig. 9. Applicant's remarks are presented according to this understanding.

For example, claims 5 and 19 recite the feature of generating a first and second timing signal at constant intervals and generating a third timing signal at intervals increasingly variable as a function of distance. In rejecting claims 5 and 19, the Examiner alleges (pg. 13) that, although Morita does not specifically teach this feature, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize a changeable period in which the boosted voltage is applied (as shown in Fig. 11B) for the purpose of improving a charge characteristic of pixels as taught by Morita (Figs. 10A–C; Figs. 11A–C; col. 12, lines 26–30; col. 11, lines 48–51).

Fig. 11B of Morita shows altering the curve of applied voltage boost within the fixed period T (see, e.g., Figs. 10A–C; Figs. 11A–C; col. 12, line 28: “the predetermined period t ”). Additionally, the altered boosted voltage curves described by Morita are set by modifying physical components (see, e.g., col. 12, line 44–47). Morita does not disclose, does not teach, and provides neither suggestion nor motivation to alter the *write-in time period*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 19 are patentable over Morita.

Claim 13 recites features similar to claims 5 and 19, and accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is also patentable over Morita, for the same reasons.

Applicant also submits claims 6 and 20 are patentable based on their respective dependencies.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/829,177

Attorney Docket No.: Q81128

Amended and New Claims

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10–16, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 24, so as to better encompass aspects of the invention. Applicant has added new claims 25–27 and respectfully submits that claims 25–27 are patentable based on their respective dependencies from claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment, and respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the amendment into the record.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 22, 2007